

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

VIRGINIA KATHLEEN YOURGULES,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0361
Filed June 5, 2015

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24.

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County

No. CR20133220001

The Honorable Scott M. Rash, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Steven R. Sonenberg, Pima County Public Defender
By Abigail Jensen, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. YOURGOULES
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Chief Judge Eckerstrom authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Miller and Judge Espinosa concurred.

E C K E R S T R O M, Chief Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Virginia Yourgules was convicted of second-degree money laundering. The trial court suspended imposition of sentence and placed Yourgules on probation for a three-year term. Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), avowing she has reviewed the record and found no arguably meritorious issue to raise on appeal. Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97, she has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record,” and asks this court to search the record for error. Yourgules has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 We conclude substantial evidence supported the jury’s verdict. See A.R.S. §§ 13-2317(B)(1). In sum, Yourgules was charged with money laundering for signing a transfer of title designating her as owner of a 2009 Nissan Maxima that her daughter’s boyfriend, M.A., had allegedly purchased with cash proceeds from marijuana trafficking. Despite having reported minimal income during the preceding three years, M.A. had paid \$66,000 in cash to purchase two vehicles, including the Nissan. He transferred title to the Nissan to Yourgules ten days after Drug Enforcement Administration agents had conducted a “knock and talk” encounter at the home he shared with Yourgules’s daughter, C.D. At the time of the transfer, Yourgules had known a vehicle belonging to C.D. previously had been seized because M.A. had used it for something involving “racketeering.” And, after Yourgules was arrested and read her

STATE v. YOURGOULES
Decision of the Court

rights pursuant to *Miranda*,¹ she acknowledged she knew M.A. transported marijuana for a living.

¶3 We further conclude the term of Yourgules's probation is authorized by statute and her probation was imposed in a lawful manner. See A.R.S. §§ 13-901(I), 13-902(A)(2).

¶4 In our examination of the record pursuant to *Anders*, we have found no fundamental or reversible error and no arguable issue warranting further appellate review. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. Accordingly, we affirm Yourgules's conviction and the probation term imposed.

¹*Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).